

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 26 have been amended to recite “wherein, the request to change the menu structure is one or more of a request to hide a portion of the plurality of menus and a request to require authentication for a portion of the plurality of menus.”

Independent claim 49 has been amended to recite “wherein, one or more of the first and second set of changes to the menu structure include one or more of a request to hide a portion of a menu and a request to require authentication for a portion of a menu.”

While the Office Action rejects claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gallagher, Applicants respectfully submit that at least the above features are neither taught nor suggested by Gallagher.

While the Office Action relies on paragraph 64 of Gallagher for the teaching of hiding a menu option, Applicants respectfully request that this assertion is incorrect.

More specifically, paragraph 64 is reproduced below:

It will be understood that the user account LDAP directory entry and the LDAP menu entries can be modified in numerous ways. In one embodiment, the user or a system administrator may use a text editor software application to open the LDAP directory entry that is being modified. The text of the directory entry may then be modified as desired to achieve the desired menu prompts. In a similar manner, the telephone number, password, personal identification number (PIN), or other attributes in the user account LDAP directory entry and menu LDAP directory entries can be modified.

As is readily apparent, there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of hiding a menu option in this paragraph.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that since each and every feature is neither taught nor suggested by Gallagher, Gallagher does not anticipate the independent claims.

The dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for at least the above reasons and for the additional feature(s) recited therein.

For example, while the Office Action relies on paragraph 65 Gallagher for the teaching of the menu and an option being eligible to be hidden, as recited in Claims 12 and 37, Applicants respectfully submit there is no teaching, suggestion, or disclosure of this feature, nor even any recognition of the ability to hide a menu item as claimed.

Claims 14 and 39 are directed toward prompting the user to at least one of attach a file, enter a path name to a file and to record a message to play to an authenticated user. While the Office Action points to paragraph 56 of Gallagher for this teaching, no reasonable interpretation of this paragraph would lead one to conclude that the subject claims are taught or suggested.

Claims 15 and 40 are directed toward the ability to delete an authentication requirement associated with at least one of a menu and an option. Since Gallagher fails to teach, suggest or disclose an authentication requirement in general, Gallagher is also deficient in teaching, suggesting or disclosing the claimed feature in these claims.

Claims 17 and 42 are directed toward providing a user with all of the options. Contrary to the Examiners assertion, Gallagher is silent regarding any teaching, suggestion or disclosure of this feature, and in particular the ability to hide a menu option.

Regarding Claims 19 and 44, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of the claimed shortcut code and associating step.

As discussed above, Gallagher at least fails to teach, suggest or disclose hiding at least one of a menu and an option. Therefore, Gallagher is also deficient in terms of disclosing restoring the at least one of a menu and an option as recited in Claims 22 and 47.

With all of the claims being clearly patentably distinguishable from Gallagher, Applicants respectfully request the subject application be passed to issuance.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

Date: 19 Dec 07

By: 

Jason H. Vick
Reg. No. 45,285
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: 303-863-9700